CENTRAL FOR THE REAL FOR THE RE

RECEIVED

OCT 2 1 2004

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent Application Serial No	
Filing Date	May 24 2000
Inventor	Kei-Yu Ko
Assignee	Micron Technology Inc
Group Art Unit	281s
Examiner	Fudene I ea
Attorney Docket No	MI22-2042
Customer No.	
Title	Gate Stack Structure

Commissioner for Patents P. O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

DCT-21-2004 14:35

## CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR § 1.8

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, the following papers are being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office at facsimile number: (703) 872-9306

- Certificate of Facsimile Transmission
- 2. Transmittal Form
- Statement of the Substance of the Interview

Dated:	10/8/104	Ву:	tatura	2 Valuer
			Pat Palmer	•
			Telephone No.	(509) 624-4276

Facsimile No. (509) 838-3424

NUMBER OF PAGES IN FACSIMILE:

	U.S. no persons are required to respond to a co	PTO/SS/21 (094 Approved for use through 07/31/2006, OMB 0561-00 Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMER Oligation of information unless it displays a valid OMB control numb				
	Application Number	09/579,402				
TRANSMITTAL	Filing Date	May 24, 2000				
FORM	First Named Inventor	Kai-Yu Ko				
	Art Unit	2815				
(to be used for all correspondence after initial fi	Examiner Name	Eugene Lee				
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	Altomey Docket Number	MI22-2042				
ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)						
Fee Transmittal Form	Drawing(s)	After Allowance Communication to To				
Fee Attached	Licensing-related Papers	Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences				
Amendment/Reply	Petition	Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)				
After Final	Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application Power of Attomey, Revocation	Proprietary Information				
Affidavits/declaration(s)	Change of Correspondence A	Address Status Letter				
Extension of Time Request	Terminal Disclaimer	Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below);				
Express Abandonment Request	Request for Refund	Certificate of Facsimile Transmission; Statement of the Substance of the Interview				
Information Disclosure Statement	CD, Number of CD(s)	(of 10/18/04)				
l	Landscape Table on CD	>				
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	Remarks					
Reply to Missing Parts/ NO FEE REQUIRED.						
Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts	f there is a fee, charge to Deposit Acc	Count No. 23-0925.				
under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53						
	URE OF APPLICANT, ATTOR	RNEY, OR AGENT				
Firm Name Wells St. John P.S.						
Signature	Signature					
Printed name Mark S. Malkin						
Date 10/21/04 Reg. No. 32,268						
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING						
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being sufficient postage as first class mail in an envethe date shown below:	ng facsimile transmitted to the USPTO ope addressed to: Commissioner for I	O or deposited with the United States Postal Service with Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on				
Signature FILED VIA FACSI	MILE					
Typed or printed name		Date				

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the Individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

5098383424 P. 03 RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 2 1 2004

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application Serial No	
Filing Date	May 24 2000
Inventor	Kei-Yu Ko
Assignee	
Group Art Unit	2815
Examiner	Eugene Lee
Attorney's Docket No	MI22-2042
Customer No	
Title	Gate Stack Structure

## STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

To:

Commissioner for Patents

ATTENTION: Examiner Eugene Lee
Group Art Unit 2815

P. O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

VIA FACSIMILE

From:

Mark Matkin (Tel. 509-624-4276; Fax 509-838-3424)

Wells St. John P.S.

601 West First Avenue, Suite 1300

Spokane, WA 99201-3828

An interview was conducted between the undersigned and Examiner Lee on October 18, 2004.

The references discussed included U.S. Patent Nos. 5,403,779 to Joshi et al.; 5,229,311 to Lai et al.; and 5,192,703 to Lee et al. The undersigned emphasized the arguments submitted in his September 15, 2004 filed response, specifically that Joshi et al. only teaches that its collimated sputtered liner coats the base of the contact opening, and that such is thereby transformed into the depicted silicide. Thereby, Joshi et al. only teaches that its liner is always <u>spaced</u> from the semiconductor material by such silicide. Mr. Lee essentially agreed with this assertion, and which is

contrary to the statement made in the June 18, 2004 Office Action in the second sentence of the second complete paragraph on page 3.

However, Mr. Lee then newly asserted that the Joshi et al. silicide was "not necessary" and that Joshi et al. could therefore be "modified" to remove the depicted silicide such that physical connection with the semiconductor material would occur. However, there is absolutely no suggestion or motivation within the Joshi et al. reference for such a modification, and the reference specifically teaches away from or against such modification as it everywhere teaches lining of the lower contact opening bases at the silicon substrate with silicide just like all the other applied prior art. The undersigned also pointed out that if the Examiner's position had merit, why hadn't an assertion merely been made that Lee et al. could have been so modified or that Lai et al. could have been so modified? The fact that Joshi et al. forms a silicide at its contact opening bases in issue does not support a modification argument anymore than modification is suggested or reasonable for either of Lee et al. or Lai et al.

The facts are clear and remain that <u>every one</u> of the applied references teaches that Applicant's claim-recited second conducting material does <u>not</u> contact the semiconducting material, which is contrary to Applicant's claims 1, 9, 11, 19 and 20. The new modification proposed by the Examiner only results from hindsight reconstruction using Applicant's application as the guide for such reconstruction. Further, Joshi et al.'s silicide cannot be considered as Applicant's claim-recited "second

WELLS ST JOHN PS

5098383424

OCT-21-2004 14:36

conducting material" due to structural limitations present in Applicant's claims for such material which are not present in Joshi et al.

Applicant's claims 1, 9, 11, 19 and 20 contain a feature or limitation not found in any of the applied art of record. The Patent Office's burden for a sustained obviousness rejection has not been met, and accordingly Applicant's claims 1, 9, 11, 19 and 20 should be allowed. Action to that end is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

Reg. No. 32,268